

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

DOUGLAS JOHNSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	22-cv-03718
v.)	
COOK COUNTY SHERIFF THOMAS)	Hon. Robert Judge Gettleman
DART, in his official capacity,)	
ANTWAUN BACON, a CCDOC officer, and)	
COOK COUNTY, a municipal corporation,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

The Plaintiff, Douglas Johnson, by and through his attorneys of DVORAK LAW OFFICES, LLC, hereby responds to the Defendants' Joint Opposed Motion for Extension of Time for Briefing of Dispositive Motions (Dkt. 75). In support, the Plaintiff states as follows:

1. The undersigned does not normally oppose extensions of time, however, he has done so in this case. This is because this case has already been unnecessarily delayed by defense counsel, with no explanation as to whether the Defendants have even begun to draft their summary judgment motion.
2. Furthermore, while the Defendants have the right to file a motion for summary judgment, they do not have the right to file it whenever they choose to do so, and there is not a lack of good cause for doing so, since all of the factors cited by the Defendants in their motion were circumstances that were known of foreseeable to them at the time they requested their

- first extension, and thus they should have more appropriately budgeted their time accordingly.
3. The Plaintiff points this Court to Judge McShain's entry of March 27, 2024 (Dkt. 50) to show this is not the first occasion that avoidable delays have occurred due to a lack of diligence on behalf of defense counsel.
 4. Although there are various claims, at its heart, this is a straightforward excessive force case with clear factual disputes that must be resolved by a jury, so the Plaintiff does not even understand how this case will be fully resolved in a summary judgment motion. The Defendants have not explained the nature of their arguments, or whether their motion seeks to dismiss the entirety of the action, or just certain claims.
 5. Thus, the Plaintiff opposes a further extension, or alternatively, the motion should be granted with a 30-day extension, and with an indication that this is a final extension.
 6. As far as prejudice is concerned, delay itself can be prejudicial, especially where, as here, the Plaintiff is 62 years old, and in poor health.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff respectfully requests this Honorable Court deny the Defendants' motion for extension of time to file a summary judgment motion.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Richard Dvorak

One of the attorneys for the Plaintiff

Richard Dvorak
Dvorak Law Offices, LLC
1 Walker Avenue, Suite 204
Clarendon Hills, IL 60514
P: (630) 568-3190
F: (312) 873-3869
richard.dvorak@civilrightsdefenders.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Richard Dvorak, an attorney, certify that on April 22, 2025, I caused the above document to be delivered to counsel of record in the captioned case through this court's electronic filing system.

/s/ Richard Dvorak
One of the attorneys for the Plaintiff